

# ADC:

THE PERENNIAL WHIPPING BOY

MISC

URBAN LEAGUE OF ESSEX COUNTY

# urban league means equal opportunity

## What does it do?

The Urban League GATHERS and PUBLISHES facts about conditions under which Negro citizens live and work

- STUDIES and ANALYZES these facts to find out what the problems are and SUGGESTS solutions
- INTERPRETS these facts for use by newspapers, magazines, radio and TV and by government agencies, private organizations, social scientists and others
- MOBILIZES the resources in the community in order to develop sound and healthy family life
- ADVISES Negro citizens on community resources and services that are available to help them
- STIMULATES self-help among Negro citizens in solving their problems
- EVALUATES major legislation and makes recommendations affecting the social and economic welfare of the Negro population

All Urban League programs are planned to bring about positive changes in the status of the Negro population. These programs are focused in the following areas:

1. Job Development and Employment
2. Education and Youth Incentives
3. Housing
4. Health and Welfare
5. Religious Resources

ADC: The Perennial Whipping Boy

Summary of the testimony presented by the Urban League of Essex County before the Welfare Investigating Committee of the New Jersey Legislature.

Fred Barbaro  
Associate Director  
Health, Welfare and Housing

The Urban League of Essex County  
58 Jones Street  
Newark, New Jersey, 07103

April, 1964

## P R E F A C E

On October 14, 1963, Fred Barbero, Associate Director of the Urban League of Essex County presented testimony before the Welfare Investigating Committee of the New Jersey Legislature in Newark. This Committee, chaired by Senator Anthony Grossi, (D-Passaic County) issued a hypercritical report on the Aid to Dependent Children Program in New Jersey.

The Urban League's concern with the Committee's findings did not stem from the fact that the report was critical. However, the criticism presented was not constructive and therefore served no useful purpose. Further, the Committee's report did not reflect a clear insight into the problems faced by the administrators of the program and the concomitant problems of the people in need of assistance.

Based upon our evaluation of the report, many of the Committee's conclusions were predicated upon dubious evidence that is not likely to withstand the scrutiny of an objective researcher. We believe that the report is unalterably biased with definite undesirable racial undertones.

In presenting his testimony, Mr. Barbero did not attempt to answer specific charges or to apologize for the Aid to Dependent Children Program in New Jersey. He pointed out, however, that in the case of welfare, as in any program, you get what you pay for.

It was not the intention of our Agency to submit a comprehensive analysis of the total ADC Program. Instead an attempt was made to clarify some of the major issues involved and to offer suggestions designed to strengthen the program. In this connection the Urban League of Essex County is prepared to cooperate with any group that is seriously concerned with an objective appraisal of the ADC Program to the end that those in need will be adequately served.

It is primarily for the above reasons that we present herein a condensed version of the testimony before the Grossi Committee. We hope that this information will be of service to those, who like the Urban League, are interested in effectively meeting the needs of those unfortunate people in our state whose needs are beyond their resources.

Sidney Reitman  
President

April, 1964

## CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	
1. Public Assistance and Unemployment	1
2. Extension of the ADC Program to Include Families with Unemployed Parents	2
3. The Elimination of Residence Requirements	8
4. The Practical Value of Social Work Services	9
5. Need for an In-Service Training Program for Staff	17
6. Need for A Constructive Approach	18
7. Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations	25
8. Notes	26
9. References Consulted	27
 <u>TABLES</u>	
I. New Jersey Statewide Summary of Unemployment	3
II. Classification of Labor Market Areas	3
III. Work Force Estimates	4
IV. Average Payments Per Recipient by Program and State	6
V. Urban and Rural Population in the United States 1930-1960	10
VI. States, According to Amount of Increase in the Population, 1950 - 1960	11
VII. Selected Data for States in the AFDC Eligibility Review, 1963	20
VIII. Percentage of Families Receiving Incorrect Payments	23

## PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND UNEMPLOYMENT

THE URBAN LEAGUE OF ESSEX COUNTY IS AWARE OF THE MANY DEFICIENCIES IN THE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM. HOWEVER INADEQUATE THIS MAY BE, IT IS THE ONLY PROGRAM THAT PREVENTS THOUSANDS OF AMERICAN FAMILIES, WHO ARE NOT ELIGIBLE FOR SOCIAL INSURANCE BENEFITS, FROM EXPERIENCING A COMPLETE ECONOMIC DISASTER. WE ALSO FORESEE THE NEED TO STRENGTHEN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE FOR THE FUTURE AS GREATER DEMANDS ARE MADE ON THE PROGRAM DUE TO THE INCREASING UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM CREATED BY AUTOMATION AND RELATED FACTORS.

I believe it will be helpful, if at the outset of this presentation we clearly define the function of public assistance in our society. The public assistance program was conceived in the belief that in this land of abundance, an American citizen must not be permitted to fall below a certain level of economic well being. It was designed to deal with only the most economically disadvantaged people. However, it was never the intention of the creators of this program nor the expectation of the legislative bodies that approved it that public assistance would solve the broad social and economic problems that cause people to need assistance. From its origin, public assistance was in theory and is in fact a remedial program. The problems of unemployment, discrimination, mental and physical illness, mental retardation and economic and cultural deprivation cannot be solved by a system of subsistent relief.

The Urban League of Essex County contends that the unemployment problem of the 1930's which necessitated the creation of a public assistance program is still, to a lesser degree, the major reason this program is needed today. Problems of desertion, illegitimacy, family breakdown and emasculation are symptoms of a greater evil. In our society a man proves his worth and gains his dignity mainly through his work. If a man is frustrated in this endeavor, for whatever reason, some form

of social pathology will inevitably arise.

We are all aware of the fact that the average national unemployment rate has been at the 6 per cent level for some time. In some of the less industrialized states the rate has been much higher. During the winter months unemployment in New Jersey has exceeded the 8 per cent level every year since 1959 and during the summer months it has exceeded the 6 per cent level. (See table I) We know that Negroes and the unskilled are hardest hit during periods of unemployment. Conditions are sufficiently severe to warrant the inclusion of certain labor market areas in New Jersey among other depressed areas in the country that now qualify for Federal economic assistance programs. (See table II) In July 1963, the unemployment rate in New Jersey was 6.3 per cent of the labor force, involving 169,350 workers. (See table III) In short, we have a serious unemployment problem in New Jersey; and as the number of unemployed persons increases, the number of people in need of public assistance will increase proportionately since many of these people are not covered by the social insurance provisions of the Social Security Act as it is now constituted.

#### EXTENSION OF THE ADC PROGRAM TO INCLUDE FAMILIES WITH UNEMPLOYED PARENTS

The local public assistance agencies soon find themselves in a difficult position due to this serious unemployment problem. The local programs, commonly known as general assistance, do not receive Federal funds for their programs. Therefore, they are not able to adequately meet the increased needs of the local population. Communities faced with this problem are forced to do one of the following:

1. Request increased State aid
2. Decrease the amount of each benefit and share available funds with a larger number of families and/or

TABLE 1

NEW JERSEY STATEWIDE SUMMARY OF UNEMPLOYMENT 1959 - 1963<sup>1</sup>

	<u>January</u>	<u>March</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>July</u>
Average Unemployment 1959-1962	217,400	196,800	165,800	173,900
Unemployment 1963	215,450	192,850	151,900	168,400
Average rate of unemployment 1959-1962	8.5%	7.7%	6.4%	6.6%
Rate of Unemployment 1963	8.2%	7.4%	5.8%	6.3%

TABLE 11

CLASSIFICATION OF LABOR MARKET AREAS AS OF AUGUST 5, 1963<sup>2</sup>

<u>Major Areas</u>	<u>Group</u>
Atlantic City	D
Camden (Sub-area of Philadelphia)	D
Jersey City	D
Newark	C
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic	C
Perth Amboy-New Brunswick	C
Phillipsburg (Sub-area of Allentown, Pa.)	C
Salem (Sub-area of Wilmington)	B
Trenton	C

Smaller Areas of Substantial Unemployment

- Bridgeton\*
- Lakewood-Toms River\*
- Long Branch\*
- Ocean City-Wildwood-Cape May\*

\* Denotes substantial and persistent unemployment

The United States Department of Labor classifies 150 major labor markets throughout the nation each month according to the nature and the extent of unemployment, using the letter designations from "A--F". Areas which are listed in groups "D", "E", or "F" (Surplus labor areas) are eligible for consideration under several Federal economic assistance programs.

Smaller labor markets with high unemployment are classified as "substantial unemployment areas" and are considered similar to the "D" through "F" classifications of major areas.

TABLE III.

WORK FORCE ESTIMATES - JULY 1963<sup>3</sup>

	Total non- Agricultural Wage & Salary Employment	Total Unemployment	Rate of Unemployment
STATE TOTAL	2,125,200	168,350	6.3
<u>Principal Labor Markets</u>			
Atlantic City	58,000	3,800	4.6
Camden	188,400	19,800	6.7
Long Branch	90,900	7,300	5.9
Jersey City	254,100	22,400	7.4
Newark	676,500	51,900	6.2
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic	390,900	30,000	6.0
Perth Amboy-New Brunswick	190,600	13,500	5.8
Trenton	111,800	6,500	4.9

### 3. eligibility requirements.

Since general assistance is not a part of the Federal program Federal controls over eligibility requirements do not exist. As eligibility requirements become increasingly stringent, stable families who no longer have an income become increasingly desperate. Some men leave home to seek work elsewhere, some men desert and some men pretend to desert. It soon becomes apparent to many men that the chances for them to ever gain employment again in their own communities are dim. I refer particularly to agricultural workers, minors, and employees of one industry towns. It also becomes apparent that the benefits in programs with Federal participation are higher and the eligibility requirements less stringent, than in the programs supported entirely by the state and locality. Some men are forced to care for the children while their wives seek employment as domestics thereby emasculating themselves before their families and the community. Others cannot contain their frustration and desert.

Without exception benefits in the Aid to Dependent Children program are higher than benefits in the General Assistance program. (See table IV) The national average payment for families receiving general assistance in July 1960 was \$66.52 a month while the national average benefit for the Aid to Dependent Children program was \$111.88. Neither amount is sufficient to raise a family in dignity but if one were given a choice between the two figures he undoubtedly would pick the larger amount. The table also indicates that in some states the general assistance benefits averaged less than \$20.00 a month.

Soon after its inception, Federal administrators of the program realized that Aid to Dependent Children, created in the belief that it would help strengthen family life by keeping children in the home, was in practice aiding in the disruption of normal

TABLE IV

Average payment per recipient and/or per case  
by program and State, (Sample), July 1960<sup>4</sup>

State	Gen. Assistance per Recipient	ADC <sup>1</sup>		Aid to Blind <sup>2</sup> Per Recipient	Old Age <sup>2</sup> Assistance per Recipient	Aid to Disabled Per Recipient
		Family Per Recipient	Per Recipient			
Total	\$ 66.52		\$ 111.28	\$ 29.22	\$ 72.79	\$ 68.23
Ala.	12.90	38.49	9.58	39.56	53.01	36.27
Ariz.	50.14	120.66	30.24	72.07	61.40	-
Ark.	14.06	60.91	16.13	56.71	52.03	39.08
Calif.	60.43	162.38	45.64	106.62	87.94	94.28
Conn.	68.37	160.75	47.35	104.47	114.15	138.2
Del.	62.98	87.62	22.82	68.44	49.95	67.31
D.C.	74.16	150.99	33.84	68.34	64.74	74.8
Ga.	26.79	87.83	23.71	52.60	47.28	54.8
Ill.	92.57	164.56	39.28	82.07	77.87	12.97
Kans.	65.40	138.97	36.37	83.94	79.73	83.37
Ky.	37.21	86.32	24.03	51.58	50.30	53.06
La.	51.27	97.45	23.76	81.96	71.41	45.1
Md.	64.74	123.18	29.54	64.99	61.92	64.65
Mass.	62.89	150.44	44.34	111.10	97.84	120.43
Mich.	92.32	134.64	37.64	81.26	76.89	99.17
Minn.	68.50	153.79	44.63	99.30	89.08	61.39
Miss.	14.80	36.45	9.41	38.72	34.60	34.41
Mo.	52.60	87.22	22.92	65.00	60.10	62.19
Nebr.	49.62	113.38	29.84	89.23	72.47	71.05
N.J.	102.88	161.36	46.29	85.81	90.10	94.91
N. Mex.	43.48	124.58	31.66	62.47	68.09	66.34
N.Y.	90.15	168.00	42.29	115.09	107.73	103.47
N.C.	26.38	77.28	19.54	54.89	42.98	49.03
Ohio	71.90	119.15	29.90	72.52	76.03	70.88
Okla.	12.97	112.35	31.62	97.79	79.43	89.16
Pa.	72.92	124.54	31.58	74.06	68.35	60.84
R.I.	68.28	136.44	37.34	80.30	80.27	84.16
S.C.	31.83	56.89	14.29	43.60	38.92	42.88
S. Dak.	30.76	108.33	31.19	59.44	62.22	64.30
Tenn.	15.65	69.74	18.83	47.46	42.33	45.98
Utah	66.70	139.59	38.60	72.34	71.72	77.17
Va.	41.68	84.25	21.04	54.59	44.34	49.66
W. Va.	31.25	95.28	24.41	41.45	39.09	41.53
Wis.	83.27	159.74	43.45	84.82	84.39	108.06

<sup>1</sup>Excludes payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments  
<sup>2</sup>Includes payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments

family activities. A child requires more than economic security for normal growth; he requires both parents in the home. From this realization emerged Title I, Section 407 of the Social Security Act. This provision stipulates that the term "dependent child shall include a needy child under the age of 18 who has been deprived of parental support or care by reason of unemployment (as defined by the state) of a parent who is living with any of the relatives specified in the original act. This temporary provision has been extended until June 30, 1967. The amendment also provides for

- a) establishing maximum use of public employment offices in the State including registration and job placement services.
- b) denying benefits if unemployed parent refuses without good cause to accept employment, in which he is able to engage.
- c) entering into cooperative arrangements with the State agency responsible for administering the vocational education program in the state with the intent of retraining individuals capable of being retrained. Benefits will be denied if unemployed parents refuse without good cause to undergo any such training.<sup>5</sup>

THE IRANIAN LANGUAGE OF ESSENCE OF THE POLICY OF THE STATE IS TO ADOPT AND IMPLEMENT THE PRINCIPLES STATED IN THE LAW OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT. THESE PROVISIONS EXEMPT THE BENEFICIARY FROM PENALTY CHILDREN PROVIDED WITH THE FUND OF THE STATE. IT ALSO PROVIDES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS WITH THE AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION. IN PROGRAMS IN THE STATE WITH THE INTENT OF RETRAINING INDIVIDUALS CAPABLE OF BEING RETRAINED.

We firmly believe that this act as it is now amended will strengthen the Aid to Dependent Children program and strengthen many families who find themselves in need of assistance.

There are sufficient provisions to guard against abuses if the program is properly administered.

If the father is permitted to remain in the home until he is employed or restrained for  
not more than a reasonable time, the burden will be greatly relieved.

#### THE ELIMINATION OF RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

THE ELIMINATION OF RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS IN INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY  
IS A MARK OF MODERNITY. IT IS PLURALITY SINCE ONE OF THE  
PRINCIPAL FUNCTIONS OF THE STATE IS TO MAINTAIN A DIVERSIFIED  
ECONOMY. IT IS ALSO A LIBERATION IN THE PUBLIC WELFARE FIELD.  
FOR MANY YEARS USELESS STATE TAXES PROVIDED THE PROVISION THAT ELIMINATED  
REHABILITATION DEPARTMENT FROM THE DEPENDENT CHILD-IN-PROGRAM.

We believe that the State of New Jersey has demonstrated a keen awareness of  
the problems of the migrant by eliminating the residence requirement  
for the migrant population. These requirements grew out of the English  
Law which controlled the movement of a modern industrial society demands a  
large mobile labor force.

Americans have always migrated to greener pastures during difficult times. The  
migration of settlers to the west has been replaced by the large migration to  
the states of the sun belt. In the first part of this report, the movements were motivated  
by a search for better employment opportunities and living conditions not always available  
in less populated states. We can continue this analysis by stating that some  
of the new migrants are unprepared for the strain of starting their families, settlers  
for the hazards of the wilderness. On the other hand, the hazard of the wilderness did  
not discourage our early settlers from seeking relief in economic oppression and the  
hazards of urban living are unlikely to discourage our latest migrants.

A review of the migration patterns for the past thirty years points out the fact that

our urban population is growing at a much faster rate than our rural population. In 1960 63.0 per cent of the population or 113,056,353 people were living in urban centers as compared to 72.9 per cent in 1950. The population of the states increased by 10.7 per cent between 1950 and 1960 but each state has not increased its population proportionately. It is not surprising that the ten states with the largest increases in population are also the most industrialized states (with the exception of Massachusetts, the state that displayed the largest increase in population through natural increase to additional births), and the states that lost sizable numbers from their populations are the states that are experiencing economic difficulties.

Summarizing the evidence, we find that people will continue to migrate to industrial states such as New Jersey to improve their economic status and achieve economic security for their families. Some newcomers will not be prepared to cope with the new environment and may need temporary assistance to help stabilize their position as they seek employment. The fact is that people will continue to come to this state despite the inclusion of a residence requirement in the ADC program. The few who may need temporary assistance (77 in the first 9 months after the abolition of the residency requirement, out of 2,527 cases in September 1962),<sup>3</sup> will be helped by the various public assistance programs or they will not be helped at all. In addition we feel that it is inconsistent to impose state residence requirements for services financed in large part by federal funds.

#### THE PRACTICAL VALUE OF SOCIAL WORK SERVICE

THE URBAN LEAGUE OF ESSEX COUNTY STRONGLY RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY ABANDON THE PUNITIVE INVESTIGATION APPROACH IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM IN FAVOR OF A SOCIAL SERVICE APPROACH. WE

TABLE 4  
URBAN AND RURAL POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES 1930-1960<sup>7</sup>

Census Date	Population				Population				Percentage of Total	
	Increase over Preceding Census		Increase over Preceding Census		Urban		Rural			
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1960	113,056,353	22,926,59	25.4	66,266,822	5,069,218	8.3	63.0	37.0		
1950	90,28,194	15,422,8.6	20.6	61,197,604	3,738,373	6.5	59.6	40.4		
1940	74,705,338	5,544,739	8.0	57,459,23.	3,417,206	6.3	56.5	43.5		
1930	69,160,599	14,907,317	27.5	54,042,025	2,273,770	4.4	56.1	43.9		

TABLE VI

Rank Order of States According to Amount of  
Increase in the Population Between 1950 - 1960<sup>8</sup>

Rank Order Number	State	Amount of Increase in Population
1.	California	5,130,981
2.	Florida	2,180,255
3.	New York	1,952,112
4.	Texas	1,868,483
5.	Ohio	1,759,770
6.	Michigan	1,451,428
7.	Illinois	1,368,982
8.	New Jersey	1,231,453
9.	Pennsylvania	821,354
10.	Maryland	757,688
11.	Indiana	728,274
12.	Virginia	648,269
13.	Louisiana	573,506
15.	Connecticut	527,954
16.	Wisconsin	517,202
17.	Georgia	498,538
18.	North Carolina	494,226
20.	Massachusetts	458,064
21.	Minnesota	431,381
23.	Missouri	365,160
24.	Tennessee	275,371
27.	South Carolina	265,567
29.	Alabama	204,997
33.	Delaware	128,207
37.	Kentucky	93,350
39.	Montana	83,743
40.	Idaho	78,554
41.	New Hampshire	73,679
42.	Rhode Island	67,592
43.	Maine	55,491
44.	Wyoming	39,537
45.	South Dakota	27,774
46.	North Dakota	12,810
48.	Mississippi	- 773
49.	District of Columbia	-38,222
50.	Arkansas	-123,239
51.	West Virginia	-145,131

FEEL THAT THE PUNITIVE APPROACH HAS NEVER LED TO THE REHABILITATION OF A SINGLE FAMILY NOR HAS IT DECREASED DEPENDENCY. WE BELIEVE THAT THE INTRODUCTION OF SOCIAL WORK SERVICES WILL HELP TO REHABILITATE FAMILIES WHERE THIS IS POSSIBLE AND ULTIMATELY DECREASE THE COST OF THE PROGRAM.

If it is agreed that public assistance was conceived as a method of protecting the individual from economic deprivation due to a fluctuating economic system that is beyond his control, why is the program administered in a punitive manner? How do we explain this paradox? Why are caseworkers called investigators, and where they are called caseworkers why do they spend most of their time investigating client eligibility instead of performing a normal casework function?

It is apparent that in any economy there will be a number of people who will not be able to compete equally with others for a variety of reasons many of which have been previously mentioned. They are as equally unprepared to function in the labor market as are the blind and physically disabled for which assistance is provided. However, the blind and the disabled have been rehabilitated and retrained and to a limited degree do participate both in the economic aspects and social life of our society. We feel that if the same efforts were made with individuals not plagued with physical limitations, even greater strides toward economic independence and social adjustment could be achieved. It should be acknowledged, however, that some cases are beyond the rehabilitation stage and some problems are beyond the capacity of any rehabilitative program to resolve. In any event the punitive approach to the administration of this program must be abandoned in favor of a rehabilitative approach. It must become apparent to all that some people in need of assistance may not be able to control their personal lives any more than they are able to control the economic climate of their state or locality.

If we did not know better we might be excused. It has just become common knowledge that few rehabilitative services exist in the U.S. today. In effect the Senate committee's report stated that no positive efforts are in effect to accomplish family stability and family rehabilitation.<sup>10</sup> Should be sufficient evidence to cast doubt on such a program. Demonstration projects conducted across the country have produced dramatic results that have not only assisted families in need but have also resulted in a decrease in program costs.

In testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, Winifred Bell in April, 1961, reviewed the results of ten demonstration projects in the public assistance programs sponsored by the Columbia University School of Social Work. The salient points of his remarks are included in this report.

During the last decade numerous demonstration projects carried out in the public welfare agencies have provided convincing evidence that substantial savings to the taxpayer can be had if they have time to consult actively with the troubled families seeking financial aid.

Our past efforts to save money have led us to keep assistance grants to the minimum to insist upon tight controls over eligibility and to spread the caseloads over small, untrained and poorly paid staffs. The 10 demonstration projects reviewed to date consistently show that this has been a "penny-wise, pound-foolish" approach. It is, in fact one way to guarantee that dependency will not only persist but will increase.

The conclusions set forth in this paper are not new. They have been presented in a variety of forms by their sponsors but the impression is secured that they are in, but not of, the public domain.

What do they prove? (1) It is wasteful to concentrate the efforts of public assistance agencies exclusively on the determination and verification of eligibility. This may well continue to be the focus for those families with simple, uncomplicated economic need including mothers who are needed at home to care for young children. But for those with complicating social problems we must focus our efforts on discovering the obstacles to self-help

and provide services to strengthen families if we wish to save money. (2) No investigator or social worker will have time to counsel with families unless he is responsible for only a "reasonable caseload", generally defined as ranging from 35 to 50 cases. (3) Skilled supervision and inservice training programs are essential to a constructive program in public assistance. This is particularly true in these days of acute shortage of graduate and experienced social workers. (4) Untrained investigators may have been able to verify eligibility, but effective family counseling requires the skill of trained social workers, and the more skillful the staff the more the community will save. This is tantamount to saying that we don't save money by hiring 10th graders to build missiles.

It is not our intention to imply that rehabilitation consists of merely returning parents to work. As previously mentioned, the state of the economy will be the determining factor in many cases. Public assistance cannot create jobs. On the other hand ADC mothers often wish to return to work because ADC benefits do not allow them to raise their families in dignity. They also wish to escape the "second class citizen" status inflicted on all recipients of public assistance. In cases where the mother wants to return to work she should be encouraged to do so only if adequate plans can be made

to provide for the care of the children, for this plan would be best for the entire family.

If a program is established with its only goal being the employment of the mother great damage may be inflicted on the family. Cook County in Illinois initiated such a program in 1960. The program was evaluated by an independent research firm that concluded the following.

The Kenwood project, in the opinion of this study's staff, is of questionable value as it is now conducted. It stresses the closing of cases through employment of the ADC mothers without adequate consideration of all the factors in the situation, as required by state policy.

Such overemphasis on closing of cases may result in some immediate savings to the department; but the way it is accomplished can be damaging to the family and can result in return to dependency for a

longer period of time more costly all around.<sup>12</sup>

On the first work day following adoption of the budget, the county commissioners, county treasurer, and county auditor issued a statement. The efficiently administered department soon gained the support of the entire community, which recognized the fact that it would be less expensive to meet the needs of the people in the county and also be less expensive for each tax payer.

House Ways and Means Committee

Marin County Calif., stands out as the site of intelligent experimentation and planning for public assistance, and particularly the ANC caseload. In 1951, a new director, Betty Presley, was employed by that department. Miss Presley brought conviction that an informed community would support an effectively organized county welfare department able to provide help with difficult family problems. She foresaw that professionally trained staff and smaller caseloads prerequisite to giving skilled social services might increase administrative costs. However, she believed such services would strengthen family relationships and individual efforts, and in many instances result in self-support, thus ultimately decreasing assistance costs.

These opinions were supported by the administrative survey in June 1951 by Kroeger & Associates which said "We are firmly convinced that there is no room for the inexperienced or poorly qualified social worker on the staff of the Marin County Welfare Department." A family care unit was established to provide intensive casework, and an experimental caseload was forthwith established in this unit. Twenty-four chronic cases were assigned to a worker with graduate social work training. In the previous 5 years, \$91,920 had been spent on these families in assistance and medical care. After 1 years work, improvement was noted in all but two cases and expenditures for the entire group began decreasing. Most of these cases involved immaturity, marital conflict, mental deficiency, mental illness, and alcoholism. They included 104 children ranging from 2 to 9 in a family, and 24 of these children were known to have personality disturbances. So convincing was the improvement that the agency concluded that intensive effort in all such cases was indicated and that "casework, given in the early stages of agency contact contributed to the prevention of personal and family breakdown and to non-dependence."

Between 1952 and 1956 further administrative changes were made, so that a senior clerk was trained to do much of the clerical work previously assigned to social workers, who were then free to concentrate on counseling families. Caseloads were reduced throughout the family case unit to approximately 40 to 50 cases and qualifications for workers were raised systematically. Salaries were raised, more supervision was provided, and the work of various related offices was coordinated. The results achieved in Marin County were then vigorously compared with results and trends in the San Francisco area as a whole. Marin County was found to show a significant drop in ANC cases per 1,000 of applications. Not only was the "discontinuance rate" higher but cases stayed discontinued longer. During the 1954-56 period the costs of ANC in surrounding areas increased, although it decreased markedly in Marin County. There were also decreases in average grants per child in Marin County as studies revealed that this probably related to both increased support from absent fathers and increased earnings of parents.

The director also pointed out that based on the average monthly aid-to-needy children cases exceeds the monthly salary of one worker. Four discontinuances exceed the salary of a supervisor.

In concluding their report, Kroeger & Associates note that the program was in jeopardy in July 1955 when a firm of administrative analysis made a survey of the welfare department for the county grand jury. In the eventful public hearing, it is noteworthy that a representative of the California Tax-Commissioner's office stated that "the administrative costs of Marin County were lower than in any of the other 11 counties of the State closest to Marin in population." He also pointed out that the administrative costs of Marin's total welfare program were the second lowest in this group of counties. He stated, and several other speakers agreed, that "if you spend \$10 more in administrative costs to save \$100 in the aid program, you've saved

\$100 in the aid program. That's the way it is. That's the way it should be. I don't know if I believe in the preventive aid program, but I know the Marin Welfare Department."

It is quite obvious from the examples cited above that the knowledge and skills to administer an effective rehabilitation program does exist. Of course we should go to the pattern described in the Kennewick, Washington, or in Cook County. The number of cases closed should not be the only criteria used to evaluate a rehabilitation program.

## NEED FOR AN INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR STAFF

THE URBAN LEAGUE OF NEW JERSEY URGES THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY TO INTRODUCE AN EFFECTIVE INSERVICE TRAINING COURSE IMPROVE WORKING CONDITIONS AND ESTABLISH A REALISTIC STATE-WIDE SALARY SCALE TO INCREASE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE STAFF, INCREASE MORALE AND THEREBY INCREASE THE EFFICIENCY OF THE PROGRAM.

The experience a new worker received during the first six months is likely to determine his attitude toward the job for the rest of his life. If the experience is poor, he may leave the position within a year never to return. Welfare departments across the country have been plagued by a large staff turnover yet only a few states have established a procedure that brings dignity to the job. Efficiency in any business cannot be maintained when one-third of the staff leaves annually.

It is imperative that during the first six months the new staff member be given a feeling of belonging to a team that is dedicated to helping people in need. Most of the new workers will enter the welfare field with the same attitudes concerning public assistance that is generally held by the public at large. If his initial experience indicated that the welfare department is concerned only with administering a punitive program complicated by miles of red tape and ever-incomplete performance, it is likely that he will only await the day a better position outside the department presents itself. Therefore, it is essential that a realistic inservice training course for new workers and a refresher course for experienced workers be established immediately. This course should include casework techniques, philosophy of the program, and materials dealing with the special problems faced by ADC recipients and minority group members. The new worker must fully understand the role public assistance plays in the entire economy and not see the program as an end in itself.

It is suggested that new workers be placed in special training units supervised by experts. New workers will stay at the first three to six months. During this period, the new workers should be trained with the emphasis being on training and learning. A well-trained worker is more likely to operate effectively and efficiently, thereby increasing his morale by providing an experience of personal accomplishment.

salary scale be established. Salaries should be at least as high as other  
should also be made to recruit graduate social workers. This would require a salary  
scale that compares favorably with the salaries offered by the private social work  
procedures that are conducive to the performance of good casework practice.

#### NEED FOR A CONSTRUCTIVE APPROACH

THE URBAN LEAGUE OF ESSEX COUNTY BELIEVES THAT IT HAS BEEN FIRMLY ESTABLISHED BY FEDERAL, STATE AND PRIVATE INVESTIGATION GROUPS THAT RECIPIENTS WHO

DELIBERATELY ATTEMPT TO PERPETUATE FRAUD IN THE AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM COMBINE A VERY SMALL PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL A.D.C. CASE LOAD, IN NEARLY THIS AMOUNT TO 2%, WE USE THE MAIL OF NEW FEDERAL APPROPRIATE SUFFICIENT FUNDS TO ADMINISTER A SOUND RELIABLE PROGRAM. WE BELIEVE THAT THIS APPROACH IS NOT ONLY MORALLY DESIRABLE BUT ALSO FISCALLY SOUND.

The recommendations suggested in this presentation will require additional funds for administrative costs. The Aid to Dependent Children program cannot be properly administered unless and unless staff who compensated and trained are employed. For this reason it has been demonstrated that if a program is to be successful it must have sufficient funds. It is also known that programs which are adequately staffed will also be lower in the cost of operation. As administrative costs increase, program costs, if properly administered, decrease.

In states where the number of recipients per capita is high or low, the effect of not at all is found that increased administrative costs increase relatively. Directly attention to Table V. This table was constructed from a report prepared at the request of the Senate Appropriations Committee by the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The study was designed to determine the amount of funds determined by the percentage of ineligible recipients in the ADC program in each state.

The evidence derived from this study indicates that a state that does not provide sufficient funds for the administration of the program will have a higher number of ineligible recipients in the program. On the other hand, the study also reveals other facts. The states that have the lowest percentage of ineligible recipients do not provide unrealistic benefits and demand unrealistic eligibility requirements. The most striking fact is that even in the states that have a relatively high percentage of ineligible

TABLE VII

Selected data for States on administration of State aid to families with dependent children, programs in relation to percent of families found ineligible in the AFDC Eligibility Review, 1963<sup>14</sup>

State	Percent of families ineligible	Average monthly cases per Eligibility Review	Frequency of periodic investigation required prior to 7/1/63	Average cost of administration per case month, fiscal yr. (months)	Current income exceeds standards	Appears to have intentionally concealed or misrepresented facts	Average payment per family per month 1963
Ala.	8.4	222	12	\$4.17	6.2	2.2	\$47.39
Alaska	8.0	(2/)	12	6.60	1.9	---	121.13
Ariz.	6.8	(2/)	6	3.82	.7	1.9	120.92
Ark.	6.6	142	12	4.96	3.4	1.6	68.28
Calif.	1.2	54	12	26.72	1.1	.7	171.64
Colo.	1.9	63	6	18.93	.4	---	146.50
Conn.	11.0	67	12	18.09	4.0	4.5	176.45
Del.	10.2	(2/)	12	10.37	5.9	7.4	103.81
Fla.	9.1	131	12	6.21	4.2	3.3	62.79
Ga.	16.4	100	12	7.08	4.0	2.1	87.47
Hawaii	6.2	70	12	19.12	2.1	2.0	132.00
Idaho	1.1	91	11	11.05	---	1.2	157.82
Ill.	4.9	81	3	19.05	4.8	1.6	206.47
Ind.	2.6	68	12	12.49	2.0	.6	111.10
Iowa	1.5	68	6	13.16	.6	.2	145.52
Kans.	.8	70	6	13.31	.4	---	149.91
Ky.	12.8	124	12	5.84	5.1	2.8	94.11
La.	3.2	85	12	14.29	1.2	1.8	99.65
Maine	2.4	110	12	8.02	1.1	.5	107.36
Md.	2.6	61	6	13.99	2.6	1.8	138.45
Mass.	.8	70	3	18.19	.3	---	172.85
Mich.	5.8	105	6	9.19	3.6	3.6	139.58
Minn.	2.1	89	12	15.87	2.1	.3	178.85
Miss.	11.6	148	6	5.67	4.7	1.1	35.52
Mo.	4.5	98	6	8.00	.8	2.6	95.11
Mont.	---	71	3	14.61	---	---	134.72
Nebr.	.9	62	12	11.32	---	---	120.34
Nev.	12.4	(2/)	12	17.24	1.9	1.2	181.47
N.H.	6.2	(2/)	12	17.63	---	6.5	168.66
<i>Lower 48</i>	2.0	69	12	17.24	1.9	1.2	181.47

TABLE VII - 2

State	Percent of families ineligible in AFDC Eligibility Review	Average monthly cases per worker	Frequency of periodic investigation of eligibility required prior to 7/1/63 1/ (months)	Average Cost of administration per case month, fiscal yr. 1962	Current income exceeds standards	Appears to have intentionally concealed or misrepresented facts.	Average payment per family per month 1963
N. Mex.	9.8	91	12	12.00	7.3	2.1	131.30
N.Y.	3.7	52	6	27.25	3.2	1.3	186.99
N.C.	3.5	104	6	7.11	3.1	1.6	96.08
N. Dak.	---	(2/)	12	16.32	---	---	164.08
Ohio	5.0	84	12	10.34	4.6	.9	121.92
Okla.	1.7	131	6	6.15	1.7	.6	124.33
Oreg.	5.4	76	12	19.26	2.7	3.5	148.57
Pa.	2.9	70	12	13.80	3.5	1.8	127.70
R. I.	3.3	72	12	15.20	.4	.8	158.63
S.C.	13.4	126	12	5.47	8.9	1.8	66.41
S. Dak.	3.1	78	6	12.07	2.1	---	121.46
Tenn.	14.3	112	12	6.34	3.3	3.8	70.72
Texas	9.6	111	12	6.78	4.7	1.8	79.15
Utah	.9	70	12	15.05	1.1	1.8	143.95
Vt.	3.1	(2/)	12	12.05	---	1.6	110.30
Va.	4.5	71	12	11.09	5.8	.8	99.71
Wash.	4.6	85	12	14.82	3.1	2.6	153.89
W. Va.	14.3	175	12	4.47	5.4	1.5	117.44
Wis.	2.9	67	12	15.33	.9	1.7	181.03
Wyo.	5.3	(2/)	6	21.33	7.2	2.6	148.35

1/ Excludes unemployed parent cases for which the Federal Government required a maximum of three months' interval between investigations

2/ Not computed; number of local-office workers carrying caseloads fewer than 25.

rents and other social services. One reason is attributed to more intentionally concealed or falsified data. The majority of the families who were found to be in arrears were making a honest and trying under. Many families were not adequately prepared to file for assistance in a timely manner. Many families were very poor, while many families received assistance below the correct amount. (See Table VIII)

What does this study tell us about the public assistance program across the nation and what does it tell us about public assistance in New Jersey? Briefly it tells us that State's attempt to use benefit denial to force a family requirements review. Current and recent trends in the program will only have a small effect on the number of people who will qualify. It is necessary to represent the facts to become eligible for assistance. In New Jersey this percentage is 1.2% out of an entire percentage of ineligibles of 2.0% a rather favorable record for the State. Another 1.2% out of 1.2% are made available to use the investigative staff to conduct additional investigations and to use similar approaches to detect 1.2% of the cases. The money certainly will be spent. This preoccupation to detect the few who will "cheat" in any program has prevented the states from diverting funds presently used for investigation to rehabilitation programs. This latest survey conducted by the Federal Government at the request of the appropriations committee proved to be very expensive and there is no evidence that all the investigations conducted help people to become self supporting. A rehabilitation program which would necessitate fewer cases per worker and the establishment of a good relationship between the client and the worker will almost eliminate entirely the existing abuses in the program, and in the process will help people in need.

TABLE VIII

Percent of families receiving assistance who were eligible for assistance  
 & but receiving payments above or below the correct amount, by state  
 AFDC Eligibility Review 1963 (Sample)

State	Percent of Total AFDC Case-load	
	Eligible families receiving assistance above the correct amount (over Payment)	Eligible families receiving assistance below the correct amount (under payment)
Alabama	42.4	20.2
Arizona	9.9	10.3
Arkansas	11.5	10.5
California	7.9	11.0
Colorado	11.1	21.7
Connecticut	26.3	20.0
Delaware	3.6	5.8
Florida	7.0	4.2
Georgia	8.7	6.0
Idaho	8.8	5.1
Illinois	27.7	30.2
Iowa	12.2	10.2
Kansas	11.0	59.3
Kentucky	21.9	25.5
Louisiana	15.9	15.0
Maryland	11.5	26.9
Massachusetts	26.3	26.0
Michigan	2.6	.8
Minnesota	18.1	12.8
Mississippi	26.4	17.8
Missouri	6.1	5.5
Montana	4.5	2.7
Nebraska	8.0	5.6
<u>New Jersey</u>	<u>12.5</u>	<u>19.8</u>
New Mexico	11.1	14.8
New York	17.4	23.1
North Carolina	20.0	60.6
North Dakota	9.6	15.7
Ohio	28.1	42.8
Oklahoma	17.2	8.6
Pennsylvania	7.5	6.2
South Carolina	10.3	2.8
South Dakota	17.8	11.1
Tennessee	5.7	2.5
Texas	12.0	7.3

Indicating in what measure the fact that the people of Morris County, Georgia  
... at difference from the people of one County in New Jersey. They are motivated  
by the same desire, not only to the people of this state. They have supported  
as the people of this state will support, public assistance when they know that it is  
not for the sole purpose of providing for the sick. They will support  
such that they are not to be given in a hasty and haphazard manner. It must  
therefore be provided that they will be adequately meeting the needs of  
the citizens of the State of New Jersey

## SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Union County Board of Social Services is aware of the many difficulties in the administration of AFDC. However, we urge that, as best as the county can prevent them on its own, the following recommendations be made to the State of New Jersey to assist in the administration of AFDC. We believe that these recommendations will assist in the solution of the unemployment problem created by automation and related factors.

The Union County Board of Social Services urges the State of New Jersey to implement the provisions specified in Title IV Section 407 of the Social Security Act. This would make the administration of AFDC a state function. The State of New Jersey would be responsible for the administration of vocational education programs in the state with the intent of retraining individuals capable of being retrained.

The Union County Board of Social Services urges the State of New Jersey to abandon the punitive investigation approach in the administration of the public assistance program in favor of a social service approach. We feel that the punitive approach has never led to the rehabilitation of a single family nor has it decreased dependency. We believe that the social service approach will rehabilitate families where this is possible and ultimately decrease the cost of the program.

The Union County Board of Social Services urges the State of New Jersey to abandon the punitive investigation approach in the administration of the public assistance program in favor of a social service approach. We feel that the punitive approach has never led to the rehabilitation of a single family nor has it decreased dependency. We believe that the social service approach will rehabilitate families where this is possible and ultimately decrease the cost of the program.

The Union County Board of Social Services urges the State of New Jersey to introduce an effective re-service training course, improve working conditions and establish a reasonable state-wide salary scale to increase the effectiveness of the staff, increase morale and thereby increase the efficiency of the program.

The Union County Board of Social Services believes that it has been firmly established by federal, state and private investigation groups that recipients who deliberately attempt to perpetuate fraud in the Aid to Dependent Children Program comprise a very small percentage of the entire ADC caseload. In New Jersey this amounts to .2%. We urge the State of New Jersey to appropriate sufficient funds to administer a sound rehabilitative program. We believe that this approach is not only morally desirable but also fiscally sound.

NOTES

1. State of New Jersey, The New Jersey Employment and Labor Market (August 1963) No. 178, p. 1.
2. Ibid., p.2.
3. Ibid., p.10
4. United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social Security Bulletin (November 1960) pp 54-56. The information for the construction of this table was gathered from five tables appearing in this issue.
5. U.S. Government, Compilation of the Social Security Laws (December 31, 1962) pp 141-142
6. The Welfare Investigating Committee of the State of New Jersey Legislature, Legislative Report on the Aid to Dependent Children Program in New Jersey (January 1953) p 58.
7. Welfare Investigating Committee, op. cit., p. 63.
8. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of the Population, 1960 p. 4.
9. Ibid., p. 1.
10. Welfare Investigating Committee, op. cit., p. 79
11. Bell, Winifred, Hearings Before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives
12. Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago, ADC: Facts, Fallacies, Future, (1962) p. 30.
13. Bell, op. cit., 375
14. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Eligibility of Families Receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (July 1963) p. viii.
15. Ibid., p. 19

#### REFERENCES CONSULTED

National Association of Social Workers, Metropolitan Washington Chapter and The Commission on Human Resources. The Public Welfare Crisis in the Nation's Capital. Washington: 1963.

State of New Jersey, Department of Labor and Industry. The New Jersey Employment and Labor Market. No. 178, August 1963.

State of New Jersey Legislature, The Welfare Investigating Committee. Legislative Report on the Aid to Dependent Children Program in New Jersey. Trenton: January 1963.

State of New York, Moreland Commission Report on Welfare. New York: January 15, 1963.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Social Security Bulletin. Washington Government Printing Office, November 1960

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Eligibility of Families Receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Washington: July 1963.

U.S. Government, Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, Hearings Before the Committee on Ways and Means House of Representatives. Winifred Bell, The Practical Value of Social Work Service. Government Printing Office, February 1962.

U.S. Government. Compilation of the Social Security Laws. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963.

Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago, ADC: Facts, Fallacies, Future, Chicago: Greenleigh Associates, 1962.

OFFICERS

SIDNEY REITMAN . . . . .	PRESIDENT
RICHARD D. MARSHALL . . . . .	FIRST VICE PRESIDENT
MATTHEW L. KISELIK . . . . .	SECOND VICE PRESIDENT
DONALD E. KING . . . . .	SECRETARY
MRS. WILLIAM J. MALONE . . . . .	TREASURER
MRS. HENRY A. DAVIDSON . . . . .	TRUSTEE
L. HAMILTON GARNER . . . . .	TRUSTEE
JERROLD STERN . . . . .	TRUSTEE

EXECUTIVE BOARD

HAROLD A. LETT  
Honorary Life Member

JULIUS LEVY, M.D.  
Honorary Life Member

HARRY ANDERSON  
GORDON BASS  
HERBERT BERGEN  
H. M. BOARDMAN  
MRS. TINA E. BOHANNON  
JOHN CERVASE  
DR. THEODORE L. DULANY  
LEO C. FIELDS  
DR. PHILLIP E. GEAR  
MRS. KERMIT GOODE  
MRS. WILLIAM H. HAYLING  
ALFRED LOWENTHAL

HOWARD MASON.  
VICTOR PARSONNET  
DR. EARL B. PATTERSON  
PHELPS PHELPS  
MRS. LEONARD D. SAVOY  
JACK SCHLESINGER  
REV. JAMES SCOTT  
MARTIN STUART  
HERBERT TATE  
REV. EDGAR THOMAS  
MRS. MAX WIENER

STAFF

JAMES A. PAWLEY . . . . .	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
RAYMOND MURPHY . . . . .	ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR
FRED BARBARO . . . . .	ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR
WILLIAM BLAKELY, JR. . . . .	DIRECTOR, SKILLS BANK
MRS. AGNES K. PARKER . . . . .	ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY
MRS. CHARLIE MAE COX . . . . .	PLACEMENT CLERK
MISS DORIS STROBRIDGE . . . . .	CLERK-STENOGRAPHER
MRS. JUNE CHILDS . . . . .	CLERK-STENOGRAPHER
MISS EUNICE MORTON . . . . .	ADMINISTRATIVE CLERK

URBAN LEAGUE OF ESSEX COUNTY

58 JONES STREET, NEWARK, N. J.

Affiliated with the National Urban League  
Member of Welfare Federation of Newark  
A Red Feather Agency

NON-PROFIT  
ORGANIZATION

U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID

Newark, N. J.  
Permit No. 3706

URBAN LEAGUE OF ESSEX COUNTY

A SOCIAL WORK AGENCY FOR INTER-RACIAL  
COOPERATION

MEMBER WELFARE FEDERATION OF NEWARK

58 JONES STREET  
NEWARK 3, N. J.

11

Miriam V. Studley  
P.O. Box 630  
Newark, New Jersey